Message

From: Paul Gennai [redacted]@google.com]
Sent: 3/26/2019 1:58:27 AM
To: Atul Kumar [redacted]@google.com]
CC: Samer Sayigh [redacted]@google.com]; Jamie Rosenberg [redacted]@google.com]
Subject: Re: Hiroshi Monthly Review: Thursday Next Week

Thanks, Atul.

In terms of logistics for tomorrow, Samer and Atul, should I assume that you're both comfortable presenting the Hug and Samsung sections specifically?

In terms of the Samsung proposal, a few thoughts:

- I realize that Jim noted a $50M a year number, but it'd be helpful to put that into perspective. What would that be in terms rev-share number, recognizing that we might prefer to hide it in some way? Note that I do think that a rev-share would be better at disincentizing other app stores being preloaded (given it'd defray revenues), which is why I liked the idea of offering a rev-share across Search and Play, but not breaking out the figures in our accounting to them
- I'm confused on the homescreen exclusivity part. If they're distributing via Play, is the fight to have them remove Galaxy Store from the homescreen really worth fighting? I can see them digging in here and I'm not sure it's worth us being tied to it.
- I've left various comments about positioning on slide 16

For Hug, my main comment is: given there's now some larger thinking being kicked off around different rev-share models for Play (progressive rates, all-ads based, etc.), I wonder if the messaging around reducing effective rev-share can be toned town (and also makes us rethink the tail program) -- this all becomes about being (a) unifying our cross-Google product story to developers and have them working across more Google products and (b) working with large partners in the way we / they should expect. Both of these things super non-contentious / difficult to argue against... it's stuff we should always be doing.

On Mon, Mar 25, 2019 at 5:29 PM Atul Kumar [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Quick updates on Samsung proposal:

1. Updated slides are in place here. Added few slides at the end for potential risk (and product details in appendix) based on Tian's and Paul Bankhead request.
2. These include app installs ads syndication (-1 screen, galaxy store).
3. Our estimate for Galaxy store 2019 net profit ranges from **-$15M to $75M**, based on assumptions below and meager public data we found.
   - Jim's suggestion is to offer **$50M/year** lump sum, structured as: "$250M to be paid to Samsung in equal installments over 5 years; subject to additional T&Cs which include our 'gets' and product integration"
   - Samsung upside could be lot larger if we agree on app install ads syndication proposal *(typical admob rev share is quite generous for publisher at 67%)*
   - Assumptions: 2-3% markets share in KR, 150 HC for store, mix of 20-30% dev rev share, MAUs/impression data based on our internal intel and store impressions # Samsung shared at a GDC session.

Cheers
Atul

On Thu, Mar 21, 2019 at 9:50 AM Samer Sayigh [redacted]@google.com> wrote:

EXHIBIT 588

I've added a few slides in the Hug section. The Investment Ask / Google P&L view slide is placeholder -- I'll work with Shafiq on how best to frame that.

On Thu, Mar 21, 2019 at 8:32 AM Jamie Rosenberg [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Getting back on this:

* For Hug, preview what is exactly going to BC. Not the full deck, but a high level summary of where the proposal landed

* For Samsung, high level summary of how the proposal is coming together -- both product and commercial elements, to make sure Hiroshi and Sameer are both supportive. Also, the data on what we think Galaxy App Store revenue is and could become is helpful. Please include the part Sameer suggested adding which is to syndicate app install adds to their -1 screen and app store and offer rev share for that. This is all to show the conceptual direction and get a temperature check, because I'm interested to put something in front of Samsung soon.

Thanks

On Thu, Mar 21, 2019, 7:39 AM Paul Gennai [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Hey Samer, what's the ETA for getting some slides in there?

On Wed, Mar 20, 2019 at 10:27 AM Paul Gennai [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
(Just Jamie, Samer and Atul)

My travel hasn't been super helpful in staying totally up to date on these two topics.

Jamie: For Hug and Samsung, do you have the top 2-3 points you want to be able to make for each? We can then play with the content.

Samer and Atul: In the meantime, can you please drop your best 4-5 slides into the relevant parts of the deck to provide Hiroshi with a status update on Hug and Samsung? Let me know once you have, and I'll jump in and take a look at the content. For both, it'd be helpful to end with a slide covering key next steps and dates.

On Wed, Mar 20, 2019 at 9:36 AM Alexi Douvas [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Would be helpful if I actually linked to the deck in my last msg...

Shell Deck: Here

On Wed, Mar 20, 2019 at 9:35 AM Alexi Douvas [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
+Lydia Ash (as fyi)

Hi All -

For Tuesday, we've got 45m, based on that I've put together the following agenda:

- [15m] Hug Update
  - *Content Owner: Samer/PaulG*
- [15m] Samsung Proposal

- *Content Owner: Samer/PaulG*
- [15m] Alt. Monetization Models
  - *Content Owner: Mike/Tian (or delegate)*

Within each section it feels like we should plan on roughly 50-60% of the time being used for discussing pre-programmed content and leaving the other time open for discussion.

If we could **target getting content in by 5PM on Friday** (with alt monetization models likely being the long-pull), I can send this over to Sameer/Jamie so we'll have Monday to get feedback and rev on that.

On Wed, Mar 20, 2019 at 6:53 AM Alexi Douvas [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Circling back with the broader group on this, we heard back from Jamie, he does want to cover an update on the pieces of Hug going to BC review as well as the potential Samsung proposal, and also thought there could be useful extra context on the alt monetization models that could be added in based on some of the convos going on at GDC this week.

I'll start the shell deck asap.

On Tue, Mar 19, 2019 at 8:09 AM Alexi Douvas [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Yeah sorry the thread name is now misleading, it got moved to Tuesday of next week. Ok, I'll reach out to Jamie and cc a few folks here to get his take, stay tuned!

On Tue, Mar 19, 2019, 8:03 AM Shafiq Ahmed [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Is this now for this Thursday or next Thursday as looks like the thread started a few weeks back although references "next Thursday"? If next Thursday then it may be beneficial to give Hiroshi a primer of what will be going to BC (assuming the dust has settled on the pieces) but agree to get's Jamie's take on where he would want to cover off. If it is this week then I think it may be too early as the content would still be very much like what was shared previously so not a meaningful difference. If going to be done live best to take him through the materials that will be taken to BC so he is aligned with the framing.

thanks

On Mon, Mar 18, 2019 at 10:23 PM Mike Petrillo [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
+Shafiq Ahmed +Samer Sayigh to advise on whether or not Hug needs to get discussed. I think the Hug BC review is scheduled to land on 01 April or 08 April, and the team still has a few things to run to ground before then. Shafiq, Samer -- Would it be helpful to review again or do you want to stay heads down on open questions?

On Mon, Mar 18, 2019 at 2:23 PM Alexi Douvas [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Hey Folks -

Following up on this now that we're roughly 1 wk out.

@Mike Petrillo - yeah the question there was aimed at Hug, we did talk about it in the review on Jan 18th, where our previous agenda was:

- **10mins**: OKR Framing: hero OKR, known painful things on the bubble.
- **20mins**: Developer Service Packs update

GOOG-PLAY-000435093

- **20mins**: P2B Update
- **10mins**: <saved for buffer throughout>

My thought track on bringing it back up was if Hug is getting ready for BC review, it's probably much more concrete then the first time it was discussed. **@MikeP/Paul** - do you have a regular sync with Jamie where you can pull for his interest in this? Or should we just reach out to him directly?

For the remaining part of the agenda, if folks don't have a topic they feel strongly about landing there Mike H flagged today that Sameer would have a bias towards discussing alternative monetization models in the upcoming review, esp. given recent events. We're going to try to get some time on the books on Friday for a brainstorm session on this (though schedules will be tricky to navigate around with GDC) to see if we can get something to discuss for high-level directional feedback.

On Mon, Mar 11, 2019 at 5:52 PM Mike Petrillo [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Sorry, just back from vacation and catching up on email.

Would this be a short status update on Hug? I know it was a detailed agenda item in last month's update, wasn't it? Would defer to Jamie since I don't know how much he's sharing with Hiroshi via regular 1:1s.

On Fri, Mar 8, 2019 at 5:41 PM Doug Lucas [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
+Mike Petrillo

On Fri, Mar 8, 2019 at 12:49 PM Alexi Douvas [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Doug/Purnima/Paul - do you have a sense for whether service packs would be ready for discussion? If so, I imagine that would take up the majority of remaining time and would be a hot item for Jamie.

On Thu, Mar 7, 2019 at 11:50 AM Mike Hochberg [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Agreed. We should go into that discussion buttoned-up.
Thanks,
Mike

On Thu, Mar 7, 2019 at 8:19 AM Doug Lucas [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Yes, agreed. That prob needs one more pass through PPS to make sure Jamie and Sameer are fully on board before we surfaceto Hiroshi

On Thu, Mar 7, 2019 at 7:13 AM Purnima Kochikar [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Hi Alexi,

This is a good list. I would hold off Play Pass until the next monthly review as we have just brought in Commercial Ops.

Doug, Tian, Mike - do you agree?

P

On Thu, Mar 7, 2019 at 6:53 AM Alexi Douvas [redacted]@google.com> wrote:
Hey Folks -

GOOG-PLAY-000435094

Now that we're (mostly) on the other side of the all-hands, I've gotten confirmation from Tracey that we're on for the Hiroshi review on Thursday of next week for 45m.

I tried to bake a short menu of topics with Mona, she wanted to hold on checking with Hiroshi until we felt locked in on our agenda proposal, but biased towards things we think need his attention or feedback vs. standing business updates.

From the Subs PPS it sounds like we want to reserve some time for Subs Policy in case Sameer can't fully cover on Friday, a few other topics that come to mind...

- Service Packs update - I'm guessing this will be relevant given Jamie's plug that he's hoping to resolve within next few weeks
- SMS/Call Log policy update and/or Location preview
- PlayPass update
- Early briefing on the Yeti/Store Policy questions
- Retail Excellence / Growth Engine (which we were going to do a while back but our review got killed)

Thoughts from the group?

LMK early pref's and I'll start getting things together, thx!

--
Purnima Kochikar
Google Play, Apps & Games
[redacted]google.com
[redacted]

--

- **Doug Lucas**
- VP, Google Play
[redacted]@google.com
[redacted]

This email may be confidential or privileged. If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to anyone else, please erase all copies and attachments, and please let me know that it went to the wrong person. Thanks.

The above terms reflect a potential business arrangement, are provided solely as a basis for further discussion, and are not intended to be and do not constitute a legally binding obligation. No legally binding obligations will be created, implied, or inferred until an agreement in final form is executed in writing by all parties involved.

--

- **Doug Lucas**
- VP, Google Play
[redacted]@google.com
[redacted]

This email may be confidential or privileged. If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to anyone else, please erase all copies and attachments, and please let me know that it went to the wrong person. Thanks.

The above terms reflect a potential business arrangement, are provided solely as a basis for further discussion, and are not intended to be and do not constitute a legally binding obligation. No legally binding obligations will be created, implied, or inferred until an agreement in final form is executed in writing by all parties involved.

--
Shafiq Ahmed | Play Finance
[redacted]@google.com [redacted]

--
Paul Gennai | Product Management Director [redacted]@google.com | [redacted]

--
Paul Gennai | Product Management Director [redacted]@google.com | [redacted]

--
Paul Gennai | Product Management Director [redacted]@google.com | [redacted]